

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication in the Office Action that claims 4, 6, and 7 are directed to allowable subject matter and would be allowed if placed in independent form. Claims 4 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form to include the features of base claim 1. Therefore, allowance of claims 4 and 6 and dependent claim 7 is deemed to be warranted.

In addition to the above amendments, claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 11 have been canceled. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form to include the features of base claim 1. Claims 7 and 10 have been amended for clarity.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected, under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Applicants' Description of the Related Art in view of Marrs et al. (US 6,135,099). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the points set forth below.

Claim 9 defines an amplification apparatus that operates a variable-output quantizer and a variable attenuator in collaboration, so that a product of an output level of the variable-output quantizer and an attenuation factor of the variable attenuator is constant.

The Office Action acknowledges that the Applicants' Description of the Related Art does not disclose this subject matter and does not cite Marrs for supplementing the teachings of the Applicants' Description of the Related Art in this regard. (see Office Action page 5, lines 1-3). Instead, the Office Action proposes that an ordinarily skilled artisan would recognize the benefit

of using a variable attenuator and a variable quantizer to provide greater flexibility in regulating a signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio (see page 5, lines 6-9).

However, the Office Action does not propose that such skilled artisan would recognize the benefit of operating a variable-output quantizer and a variable attenuator such that a mathematical product of an output level of the variable-output quantizer and an attenuation factor of the variable attenuator produces a constant value, as recited in claim 9. The Applicants' claimed subject matter provides a distinct advantage over the prior art. More specifically, the claimed subject matter supports changing the output of a power supply voltage control section in accordance with the output of a quantizer, so as to prevent a decrease in S/N ratio and extend the dynamic range of a control signal output from the power supply voltage control section and, thus, an output signal of a high-frequency power amplifier (see specification page 43, lines 13-19). (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.) It is submitted that the individual or combined teachings of the ADRA and Marrs do not suggest the Applicants' claimed configuration or the benefits derived therefrom.

Accordingly, the Applicants submits that the teachings of the ADRA and Marrs, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 9. Therefore, allowance of claim 9 and dependent claim 10 is considered to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: May 4, 2009  
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06103  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 659-6966  
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559